

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE

May 7, 2003
MAG Cholla Room, 2nd Floor
302 North First Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Jim Book, Glendale
Alan Sanderson, Mesa
Mike Mah, Chandler
Mike Sutton for Bruce Ward, Gilbert
Yogesh Mantri for Nicolaas Swart,
Maricopa County
Bob Steele, Phoenix
Bob Ciotti, RPTA
Iven Wooten for Terry Conner, DPS
Bob Maki, Surprise

Bruce Dressel, Scottsdale
Jim Decker, Tempe
Tim Wolfe, ADOT
Scott Nodes, Peoria
Chuck Hydeman, Goodyear
Mary Kihl, ASU
*Alan Hansen, FHWA
*Dennis Murphy, Phoenix Aviation
*Michael Smith, Avondale

OTHERS PRESENT

Carrol Reynolds, Buckeye
Carl Burkhalter, ADOT
Jimmie Dixon, Glendale
Lynn Timmons, Phoenix
Mike Nevarez, Phoenix Transit
Matt Burt, Battelle Inc.
Xiao Qin, MAG
Sarath Joshua, MAG

Chris Jordan, Kimley-Horn Associates
Brent Crowther, Kimley-Horn Associates
Kimley-Horn Associates
Paul Ward, MAG
Anne McCracken, Valley Metro
Amy Corathers, Scottsdale
Steve Ramsey, Scottsdale
Janet Secor, Scottsdale

* Not present or represented by proxy

1. Call to Order

Chairman Jim Book called the meeting to order at 9:35 AM.

2. Call to Audience

Chairman Book made a call to the audience providing an opportunity to members of the public to address the ITS Committee. There was no comment from the audience.

3. Approval of April 2, 2003 Meeting Minutes

Chuck Hydeman moved and Bruce Dressel seconded, and it was unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the April 2, 2003 ITS Committee meeting.

4. Program Managers Report

The following is a summary of the report to the committee provided by Sarath Joshua:

- Update on ITS On-Call RFQ – The second phase of the RFQ process is underway and MAG has started receiving responses from the selected consultants.
- ITS Projects, Architecture and Systems Engineering Process – All ITS projects in the region are now required to include a systems analysis. What this means is that the project definition or design stage must include a systems engineering analysis. The MAG ITS Strategic Plan (April 2001) describes the regional architecture – see page 14 and page 18 of the document. It describes the needs and the types of ITS projects and systems that are priorities for the region. The Strategic Plan identifies User Needs and Equipment Packages. Every MAG member agency needs to have a copy of this document. A guidance paper developed by Alan Hansen and James Colyar of FHWA was sent to all member agencies. This paper describes what must be carried out at the design stage.

5. Regional Architecture and ITS Projects Seeking TIP Close-out funds

In introducing this item, Sarath Joshua indicated that all federally funded ITS projects are now required to show compatibility with the regional ITS architecture. This has been defined at a high level as the demonstration of consistency of the proposed project with regional architecture. This requires that proposed ITS projects match the ITS user services and the associated ITS market packages identified as regional priorities in the MAG ITS Strategic Plan. This check is automatically accomplished through the ITS project rating system during the normal TIP process.

Member agencies that were requesting TIP close-out funds were provided an opportunity to present their projects for review by the committee. Mike Mah presented a project for City of Chandler to install Traffic Signal System Upgrades for a federal cost of \$1,440,990. In response to a question from Tim Wolfe, Mr. Mah responded that this project is not in the TIP at present and is currently being undertaken with the city's general funds. In response to a question regarding the ability to obligate these projects by the September 15th deadline, Mr. Mah replied that these are equipment purchases and would have no difficulty obligating. In response to a question on how much funds are available Paul Ward replied that a total of \$14.3 million is available at this time of that \$10m is CMAQ. He further stated that \$22m in funding requests have been received so far. He also stated that the City of Chandler request is in line with current policy. A request for \$12m for LRT final design has been received. Other requests included one project from Gilbert; four from Glendale; one from Goodyear for a bridge project; one from MAG for street sweepers; one from Maricopa County for a roadway project; one from Paradise Valley; one from Surprise and two from Phoenix. Alan Sanderson asked how possible it is to receive close-out funds for a project that is not in the TIP. Paul Ward responded that it is possible to get funds provided that the project can be obligated through the ADOT process. He also indicated that it is likely that additional funds

will be available in mid-August through redistributed obligation authority allocated to AZ from other states – in the range of \$1.5m to \$2m.

Jimmie Dixon presented the two projects for Glendale. The first project involved the purchase four (4) Variable Message Sign trailers for \$340,000; the second project involves design and development of ITS traffic management facilities at the Coyotes. Cardinals Complex for \$190,000. He described how these two projects will incorporate cameras, signs and communications to motorists for managing traffic around the complex.

Chuck Hydeman presented two project funding requests from City of Goodyear. They were the fiber backbone project – a request to increase programmed funding by \$ 425,000 City of Goodyear; and an increase of programmed funds for the Traffic Management Center by \$ 150,000. During the ensuing discussion it was discovered that the Goodyear projects were programmed for a future year in the TIP. Since the request was not for advancing the projects to the current year they were not eligible for close-out funds. Mr. Hydeman was requested to submit the projects during the normal TIP process to scheduled to commence later in the year.

Chairman Book asked if the committee wanted to prioritize the proposed projects or recommend all of the proposed projects. Sarath Joshua reminded the committee that one ITS project proposed by Phoenix was recommended at the April meeting and also another project large ITS project was deobligated. He further stated that it may be best to recommend all projects to TRC. Chairman Book asked if all agreed. Yogesh Mantri moved that all three projects presented be recommended to the TRC. Mike Mah seconded. In discussing he motion, Bob Maki asked if Yogesh Mantri had reviewed the Bell Road ITS project suggested to the County by Surprise. He responded that after internal discussions at Maricopa County a decision was made not to request close-out funds for that project. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

6. Report on Scottsdale's Indian School Road Project Corridor ITS Evaluation Project

Amy Corathers introduced this item and pointed out that this evaluation was undertaken by Scottsdale with the approval of the City Council to demonstrate the value of ITS applications within the city. Matt Burt, Project Manager from Battelle Inc. presented the findings of this evaluation study. One of the first technology investments by City of Scottsdale. Three basic capabilities:

A) Update traffic signal timing plans

Two types of signal timing: 1) strategic timing plans based on average conditions;

2) active timing plans based on realtime observations

B) Incident management is also a big part of

C) Construction and special event management

System components: CCTV cameras to monitor, centralized TMC, arterial VMS signs,

Two alternative traffic detection devices tested were radar and video based.

The evaluation corridor was 3 miles long from 64th St to Pima Road – 5 CCTV cameras and 6 VMS. Total cost of the project was \$3m approx half was federal funds.

The study consisted of:

Before and after travel time study

Extensive in-person observations of special events – Phoenix Open and Barrett Jackson Auto Auction

Study Questions: Has the system been embraced by the TMC staff?

In six months the following was accomplished: 400 plus timing plan modifications and 150 plus VMS messages posted

Other benefits:

7 percent reduction in delay at intersections

Police officer labor savings due to the officers being stationed at the TMC

TMC staff was able to accomplish 3 rounds of signal timing changes in the time that used to take one such change.

Alternative detectors: radar RTMS device did not perform as well as expected at intersections but staff felt they are better suited for mid-block locations

Videodetection had problems with sun glare, shadows etc. but they allowed that intersection to be observed, although the fixed camera view reduced its usefulness.

Total annual benefits estimated at \$2.2millions

The delay savings were based on \$13 per hour value as used by TTI.

Chairman Book thanked Scottsdale for the presentation.

7. Briefing on the MAG Town Hall Meeting

Tom Remes of MAG provided a briefing to the committee on the first Regional Transportation Town Hall event on March 28, 2003. He informed the committee that nearly 100 people participated in this event. Participation was by invitation only and was limited to community leadership groups. They were sent several issue papers on prior to the meeting. At the meeting they were briefed on the Regional Transportation Plan and projections of population and employment in the region. During 10 breakout groups sessions the participants were asked:

What do you like about transportation system?

What are the problems that you see?

What are your ideas for now and future?

What are your top five solutions?

The results from the group discussion pointed to the key issues.

1. Additonal funding was needed

2. Multimodal systems are needed

3. Landuse planning must be included in regional transportation planning and need to look at build-out conditions not just current conditions

4. Transit options such as high capacity must be included

5. Additional marketing to educate people

Most important multimodal components identified were:

1. Synchronized traffic signals
 2. More use of ITS & complete the arterial system & High capacity transit
 3. Expand LRT
 4. Standardize traffic control – signage speed limit, left turn arrows; enforcement
8. Status Reports by Committee Members
Bob Ciotti stated that he would like to give an update on transit ITS at a future meeting. Carl Burkhalter of ADOT was introduced to the committee.
9. Next Meeting Date

Next meeting date was announced as 9:30 AM on Wednesday June 4, 2003. The Concept of Operations project meeting was announced as 10:30 AM on the same day.
9. Adjournment

Chairman Book adjourned the meeting at 11:05 AM.